

PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

February 9, 2000

CALL TO ORDER:

Vice-Chairman Voytilla called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Beaverton City Hall Council Chambers at 4755 SW Griffith Drive.

ROLL CALL:

Present were Vice-Chairman Vlad Voytilla; Planning Commissioners Eric Johansen, Betty Bode and Chuck Heckman. Chairman Dan Maks and Planning Commissioners Tom Wolch and Sharon Dunham were excused.

Principal Planner Hal Bergsma, Senior Planner Barbara Fryer and Recording Secretary Sandra Pearson represented staff.

VISITORS:

The meeting was called to order by Vice-Chairman Voytilla, who presented the format for the hearing. There were no disqualifications of the Planning Commission members. No one in the audience challenged the right of any commissioner to hear any agenda items.

Vice-Chairman Voytilla asked if there were any visitors in the audience wishing to address the Commission on any non-agenda items. There were none.

Tom Wolch appeared at 7:03 p.m.

Principal Planner Bergsma mentioned an Open House offered by Metro from 5:30 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Thursday, February 10, 2000, at the Tualatin Hills Nature Park Interpretive Center. He noted that the general topic is natural resource issues, adding that the focus is on the protection of stream corridors along streams in the region. He observed that the primary concerns are compliance with Statewide Planning Goal 5 which pertains to protection of natural resources and the protection of fish, particularly steelhead and Chinook salmon, which have recently been added to the endangered species list by the National Marines Fisheries Service. The National Marines Fisheries Service has proposed a rule which would define what constitutes a take of these species, and in response, Metro is drafting amendments that would be incorporated in Title 3 of the Metro Function Plan. They have been working on these amendments for approximately one-year with the assistance of a technical advisory committee, and the proposals are now complete and available for discussion. He mentioned that the proposals involve regulated

areas, or buffers, as wide as 200 feet on each side of the stream. He stressed that this could be ANY stream, observing that Beaverton City Hall is located within a regulated area because it is within a defined flood plain and urged anyone concerned or interested in this issue to attend the open house.

Commissioner Heckman questioned whether this means 200 feet from the average edge of a stream or 200 feet from the center of the stream. Mr. Bergsma informed him that this is from the top of the bank of the stream or floodplain, emphasizing that a flood plain may extend further than the 200 feet.

Mr. Bergsma noted that in the case of a slope of 25% or greater, there would also be a setback 25 feet from the top of the slope. He mentioned that this could affect some of the steep areas in the Cooper Mountain area. Commissioner Heckman mentioned that they had seen some very steep slopes on a previous tour of the area.

Mr. Bergsma mentioned that Metro had already adopted regulations under Title 3, in response to Statewide Planning Goals 6 and 7, noting that these regulations would be in place of or in addition to the regulations that have already been adopted.

Vice-Chairman Voytilla questioned the time for this Open House and Mr. Bergsma repeated that it is scheduled for 5:30 p.m. to 8:00 p.m., Thursday, February 10, 2000.

OLD BUSINESS:

PUBLIC HEARING

A. CPA 99-00013/TA 99-00004 – GOAL 5 WILDLIFE HABITAT & TREE PRESERVATION AMENDMENTS

The proposed amendments implement Periodic Review Order #00717 (formerly WO #00628), Work Task #3 – Statewide Planning Goal 5 Wildlife Habitat. This Work Task amends City Comprehensive Plan policies and Development Code regulations implementing Oregon Administrative Rule Section 660-23-110 for protection of Significant Tree, Tree Groves and Historical Trees as identified on the Significant Natural Resource Map. Further, these amendments; (1) establish guidelines for protection of trees identified on the referenced map, and (2) provide protection for trees identified on the Washington County Community Plan and Map as a protected resource following annexation to the City.

Senior Planner Barbara Fryer reported that this Staff Report is connected with the next Staff Report, regarding CPA 99-00017/CPA 99-00018 – LOCAL TREE INVENTORY UPDATE, both of which staff would like to continue until August 9, 2000. She added that a grant has been requested from the Oregon Department of Forestry to complete inventory reassessment of the entire City, as requested by the Planning Commission. She noted that it is hoped that this will include areas that may have been missed in the previous assessment, as well as areas that were not addressed and areas that were annexed since the last inventory. She

mentioned that this will also allow for the development of criteria related to Goal 5 and the adoption of the inventory based on a Goal 5 premise. The request for a continuance until August 9, 2000 includes both the inventory assessment and the regulatory framework surrounding that particular assessment.

Commissioner Heckman questioned involvement with future annexation, and Ms. Fryer explained that the annexed areas have already been dealt with, adding that this issue involves looking at the existing inventory from a Goal 5 perspective, as opposed to the current analysis that was prepared in 1984.

Commissioner Heckman requested clarification, whether this is primarily to establish the guidelines for protection for trees. Ms. Fryer explained that this effort includes criteria with focus on guidelines for tree protection and establishes criteria based on Goal 5 scenic and open space values with reassessment of all the sites based upon those criteria.

Commissioner Heckman mentioned that it should only be necessary to submit this information to Salem one time. Ms. Fryer agreed, adding that the purpose for the grant from the Oregon Department of Forestry (the Urban Forestry Community Assistance Program) is to provide funding for an outside consultant to provide the necessary services. She advised that as a component of this grant, a brochure will be prepared for the public indicating tree planting, tree pruning and tree care guidelines, as well as necessary information to anyone with a significant tree or tree grove on their property.

Emphasizing the importance of this issue, Commissioner Heckman expressed his appreciation of the efforts of the staff.

SANDRA CAMLEY, P.O. Box 1953, Beaverton, OR 97075, congratulated staff for their appropriation of a grant for this project and their plan for the brochure. She expressed appreciation that the advisory committee was included in this process. She discussed the Goal 5 Project and significant trees and groves within the City of Beaverton, emphasizing her desire to move forward with the 25% level of protection for those trees and groves. Noting that Chairman Maks had expressed agreement on this issue, she noted her concern that there is no current project relating to Goal 5 (the 25% level of protection for significant trees and groves). She questioned the current code review process and expressed concern with the fact that staff does not have sufficient authority to add this 25% level of protection, because it is considered an improvement.

Vice-Chairman Voytilla stated that he would have to refer this issue to staff for comment, noting that the Planning Commission generally relies on staff to make recommendations for their review and approval.

Ms. Fryer noted that Ms. Camley is referring to the current rewrite of Chapter 40 of the Development Code, adding that Senior Planner Steven Sparks is working

on resolving certain issues in this code through the Code Review Advisory Committee (CRAC). She emphasized that the Goal 5 issue that staff is requesting be postponed until August 9, 2000 could provide for the increased percentage of protection.

Ms. Camley questioned the Planning Commission's ability to increase the level of protection for trees in some way other than through Goal 5. She inquired whether the Planning Commission could give direction to staff at this time to increase the focus of the Code Review Project, rather than at a later date.

Vice-Chairman Voytilla emphasized that the Planning Commission is not yet aware what the staff recommendations will be, adding that it is possible to explore options for expediting or improving the perimeters of the project.

Ms. Camley commented that Vice-Chairman Voytilla is discussing Goal 5, while her concern at this time is not related to Goal 5, but the Code Review Project.

Vice-Chairman Voytilla reminded Ms. Camley that the discussion at this time is limited to this particular agenda item, which involves the Goal 5 Wildlife Habitat & Tree Preservation Amendments, and that non-agenda items can not be addressed at this particular time.

Ms. Camley noted that originally the 25% level of protection for significant trees and groves had been part of the Goal 5 Project, which is the current agenda item.

Ms. Fryer observed that some of the confusion is being created due to the fact that the Chapter 40 amendment is taking some of the work originally proposed under TA 99-00004, adding that Ms. Camley is merely seeking clarification that the 25% protection level is being continued.

Ms. Camley questioned the procedure for initiating the establishment of an official project involving tree protection.

Commissioner Heckman mentioned the minutes of the meeting of November 10, 1999, noting that this particular meeting had addressed many of her concerns. He informed her that a copy of these minutes is available on the table at the back of the room.

Ms. Camley observed that the Advisory Committee is working on expediting the project and that portions of project are being separated from one another.

Commissioner Heckman urged Ms. Camley to discuss the situation with staff as soon as possible.

Noting that she had discussed this with staff, Ms. Camley reminded Commissioner Heckman that the staff had informed her that while they have no authority to add this 25% level of protection, the Planning Commission does.

Stressing that the staff prepares the agenda for the Planning Commission, Commissioner Heckman expressed his opinion that she is addressing an issue that they are unable to address at this particular time. He added that the staff is aware of her concerns, as well as those of the Planning Commission and others, and that although she is less than pleased with the timeliness of the project, he expects that she will be pleased with the results.

Commissioner Johansen questioned whether a citizen has the ability to initiate a text amendment, and Senior Planner Fryer informed him that this can be done, although they would be required to pay the fee associated with a text amendment as well as propose specific language.

Commissioner Johansen expressed agreement with Commissioner Heckman's comment that this issue should be dealt with as a whole, rather than in segments.

Commissioner Bode questioned concern with the 25% level of protection and possible negative results if it not met.

Noting that the 25% level of protection had been proposed over one year ago, Ms. Camley informed her that her concerns are of a general nature, rather than a specific nature, although she is anxious to see some development.

Commissioner Heckman expressed his support of staff request to continue this Public Hearing.

Commissioner Johansen MOVED and Commissioner Heckman SECONDED a motion to continue the Public Hearing on CPA 99-00013 -- Goal 5 Wildlife Habitat & Tree Preservation Amendments to a date certain of August 9, 2000.

The question was called and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

Commissioner Johansen MOVED and Commissioner Heckman SECONDED a motion to continue the Public Hearing on TA 99-00004 – Goal 5 Wildlife Habitat & Tree Preservation Amendments to a date certain of August 9, 2000.

The question was called and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

B. CPA 99-00017/CPA 99-00018 (Ord. #s to be determined) LOCAL TREE INVENTORY UPDATE

The proposed amendments implement Periodic Review Order #00717 (formerly WO #00628), Work Task #3 – Goal 5 Inventory. This work task is intended to bring the City of Beaverton Comprehensive Plan Map up to date with respect to

Natural Resources. The amendment (CPA 99-00017) would update the current Tree Inventory Map to include significant groves and trees that have been altered since the last inventory. The proposal includes adding five new significant trees to the inventory, which are located on the following map and tax lots: 1N120BA03900, 1S133BD90000, and 1S128DA06100, and in the right-of-way adjacent to SW Davies Road between SW Harness and SW Stallion Court. Recommendations regarding the significance of the proposed trees will be discussed in detail in the staff report.

The text update (CPA 99-00018) includes one new page per significant grove or tree, which details the grove/tree health, a general comment about the grove/tree and a photo. Staff proposes adopting the map (CPA 99-00017) as an update, adding appropriate new significant trees (CPA 99-00017 and CPA 99-00018) and updated pages (CPA 99-00018). Please note the new computer-generated map would replace the current map in its entirety, however, the new photos and health reports will supplement existing data.

On question, Ms. Fryer offered no additional comments regarding this staff report, reminding those present that staff is also recommending that this be continued to August 9, 2000.

On question, no one in the audience expressed the desire to address the Planning Commission on either of these items.

Commissioner Heckman discussed significant groves and trees and his approval of action to correct flaws in the original data.

Commissioner Bode MOVED and Commissioner Heckman SECONDED a motion to continue the Public Hearing on CPA 99-00017 – Local Tree Inventory Update to a date certain of August 9, 2000.

The question was called and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

Commissioner Bode MOVED and Commissioner Heckman SECONDED a motion to continue the Public Hearing on CPA 99-00018 – Local Tree Inventory Update to a date certain of August 9, 2000.

The question was called and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

C. **CPA99-00005/CPA 99-00006 (Ord #s to be determined) LOCAL WETLAND INVENTORY**

The proposed amendment implements Periodic Review Order #00717 (formerly WO #00628), Work Task #3 – Goal Inventory. This work task amends Beaverton's Comprehensive Plan by adding supporting data to the Local Wetland Inventory and Riparian Assessment and text to the Comprehensive Plan

explaining the purpose of the map. The map amendment (CPA 99-00005) would bring the City of Beaverton Comprehensive Plan Maps up to date with respect to Natural Resources by implementing Goal 5 requirements to prepare and adopt a Local Wetland Inventory and Riparian Assessment.

The map proposal amends Beaverton's Comprehensive Plan Significant Natural Resource map to update the 1984 data by adding Local Wetland Inventory and Riparian Assessment map areas, information required under Statewide Planning Goal 5. The map was prepared according to the methodology prescribed by Goal 5 implementing regulations (OAR 660-23-090 AND OAR 660-23-100). The text portion of the amendment (CPA 99-00006) adopts the supporting documents, including the methodology for implementing Goal 5 Local Wetland Inventory and Riparian Assessment regulations (OAR 660-23-090 AND OAR 660-23-100).

Noting that this proposal has been brought before the Planning Commission several times in the recent past, Senior Planner Fryer said the consultants are in the process of continuing their field inventory, data sheets and map products. She reported that the information should be submitted to staff by the end of the week, that they expect to have this available to the public by February 21, 2000, and requested a continuance until March 22, 2000.

Commissioner Heckman questioned whether any of these inventories had ever been conducted by anyone other than Shapiro and Associates.

Ms. Fryer responded that although a number of consultants do perform local wetland inventories, this is the first one that has ever been required of the City of Beaverton.

Commissioner Heckman discussed Shapiro and inventory work they conduct for the City of Beaverton, questioning whether they are the most qualified to provide these services. Ms. Fryer explained the decision to retain this consultant group, noting that they had been retained to perform three inventories as a Goal 5 Package and that they had been selected based upon their qualifications, recommendations of other jurisdictions and their reputation for public involvement. She outlined the primary focus of the overall project, which includes the historical inventory update, the tree inventory update, the tree inventory assessment of areas that annexed since the original inventory, and the local wetland inventory/riparian assessment.

Vice-Chairman Voytilla mentioned the last page of the staff report, noting all of the dates this had been submitted to the Division of State Lands (DSL), and questioned what had caused this delay.

Ms. Fryer noted that it had been submitted to DSL in December 1998 and again in January 1999, when they indicated that it had not been received, and DSL did not begin their review until November 1999. She noted that although they had

expected to receive comments back in time for the meeting in February 1999, due to staffing problems, DSL had been unable to meet this date.

Vice-Chairman Voytilla questioned the impact on the staff and the cost to the City, and Ms. Fryer assured him that the consultants are committed to complete the project with the amount of funding that has been budgeted, adding that they are currently providing services beyond the compensation budgeted.

On question, no one in the audience wished to address this issue.

Commissioner Wolch MOVED and Commissioner Heckman SECONDED a motion to continue the Public Hearing on CPA 99-00005 – Local Wetland Inventory to a date certain of March 22, 2000.

The question was called and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

Commissioner Wolch MOVED and Commissioner Bode SECONDED a motion to continue the Public hearing on CPA 99-00006 – Local Wetland Inventory to a date certain of March 22, 2000.

The question was called and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS:

WORK SESSION

Mr. Bergsma discussed the update of the Land Use Element of the City's Comprehensive Plan, noting that although they had anticipated having a public review draft available by Monday, February 14, 2000, it will probably not be available until the end of the month. Observing that they are taking additional time to ensure that the document had been properly drafted prior to release to the public, he outlined the function of the Land Use Element and areas they hope to include in the plan. He asked the Planning Commission about preparing separate plan and documents for different neighborhoods within the City, and presented some examples of several county community plans, as well as plans for two Portland neighborhoods. On question, he informed Vice-Chairman Voytilla that he had not contacted the City of Portland to determine the success of their plans.

Vice-Chairman Voytilla observed that his experiences with the community plans for Washington County and the City of Portland had been favorable and that there is a great deal of input from the citizens of these areas.

Mr. Bergsma discussed the advantages of having these area development plans available, particularly citizen involvement in the neighborhood planning process and public relations.

Commissioner Heckman expressed his preference for the word “template”, rather than “framework”, which suggests “where do we go from that”...

Mr. Bergsma informed Commissioner Heckman that the County’s policy document is “The Comprehensive Framework Plan for the Urban Area”, and includes all general policies within the urban incorporated area, and the community plans are a subset of that plan.

Commissioner Heckman expressed his approval of the County’s policy document and mentioned the Washington Square Plan, specifically how much of Washington Square would be under Beaverton’s jurisdiction and whether there would be difficulty in coordinating with Washington County and the City of Tigard.

Ms. Fryer noted that primarily the areas referred to as Cascade Commons and Nimbus would be considered under the jurisdiction of the City of Beaverton. She identified the areas covered on the map, noting that although the area known as Fanno Creek is included, there are currently no density increases in the Fanno area. She noted that there are no current recommendations for amendments to the current zoning for the area north of Hall Boulevard. She discussed a commuter rail station in the Cascade Commons area, observing that the plan provided for an anticipated housing component and increased density in this area. She indicated that they expect to increase overall employment in this area under the City of Beaverton’s planning, adding that they had anticipated increasing the capacity of the area so many of the buildings would be two and three story office complexes.

On question by Commissioner Heckman, Ms. Fryer agreed that three jurisdictions have been involved in preparing the Washington Square Plan – Washington County, the City of Beaverton and the City of Tigard.

Commissioner Heckman stated that the size of the Washington Square planning area is significantly larger than the Raleigh Town Center.

Ms. Fryer discussed the regional center, noting that it may be slightly larger than our downtown regional center, stressing that this is intended to be a regional center, rather than a town center.

Commissioner Heckman observed that this is an ambitious plan, and Ms. Fryer agreed, adding that it is more ambitious than our regional center. She assured Commissioner Heckman that the three jurisdictions had more or less reached an accord, adding that the City of Beaverton prefers one of the City of Tigard’s alternatives to the other, unless the proposed commuter rail station materializes, at which point additional housing could be planned.

Mr. Bergsma advised that the housing issue is still under consideration, adding that a commuter rail station would increase the probability of adding housing, although the area is generally designated as an employment area.

Commissioner Heckman called attention to the dates Mr. Bergsma had specified, noting that these particular dates do not fall on Wednesdays. Mr. Bergsma informed him that staff intends to come back with this information on March 15, 2000, and Commissioner Heckman stated that he had mistakenly understood him to say March 13, 2000.

Noting that this is an ambitious program, Commissioner Heckman stated that he is looking forward to seeing it happen and suggested that plans be made as soon as possible.

Mr. Bergsma assured Commissioner Heckman that more consideration would be given to separating portions of the Land Use Element, particularly those provisions that pertain to the downtown area. He suggested that these provisions be included in a separate document, possibly an appendix to the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Heckman questioned whether adding an appendix to a plan is a common practice.

Noting that appendix may not be the correct term, Mr. Bergsma assured Commissioner Heckman that any such document would have to be adopted by Ordinance.

Commissioner Bode requested clarification of the boundaries of Cascade Commons.

Ms. Fryer discussed the Beaverton portion of Washington Square, indicating this area on the map and explained what is included in the overall study. She informed Commissioner Bode that the area is called Cascade Plaza, rather than Cascade Commons.

Commissioner Johansen expressed his approval of this proposal, and requested clarification of application of Comprehensive Plan Amendments, Conditional Use Permits and Subdivision Applications.

Mr. Bergsma agreed that many design provisions of sub-area plans may not apply to development applications – either an applicant is not required to address them or they are not applicable.

Commissioner Johansen mentioned vision statements in the community plans in the county system, observing that an application could be considered in support of or not in support of a specific vision statement.

Mr. Bergsma informed Commissioner Johansen that this does not apply in terms of individual development applications, although it does become applicable when someone proposes to amend the document.

Commissioner Wolch expressed his support of focusing on specific areas, emphasizing that a Citywide or countywide area becomes overwhelming. He noted that focusing on specific areas is a good idea that creates a sense of ownership and promotes citizen involvement.

Mr. Bergsma observed that on a long-term basis, as the City annexes out into other areas they may assume more responsibility for plans for some of these communities.

Commissioner Wolch questioned the City's position in a County planning process.

Mr. Bergsma indicated that the staff is working on defining the City's role in the County's planning process, adding that ongoing County planning activities in the town center areas are being monitored, as well as other processes they are involved in. Noting that they have frequent discussions concerning these issues, he informed Commissioner Wolch that a letter or memorandum of understanding between the two entities is under consideration to more clearly define the role of the City in county planning processes. He mentioned plans for proposals for updates to the Urban Planning Area Agreement between the City and the County, adding that although nothing is clearly defined at this time, progress is being made in that direction.

Commissioner Wolch questioned the term "engrossed ordinance".

Mr. Bergsma explained that an "engrossed ordinance" is basically an ordinance in which the Board of County Commissioners has authorized amendments to an ordinance, noting that "engrossed" indicates that it has been amended from its original filed version.

Vice-Chairman Voytilla questioned the frequency at which the County's community plans are updated.

Observing that some have been amended more than others have, Mr. Bergsma emphasized required compliance with State law. He described the County's planning process for the Light Rail Stations, which he was involved in. He suggested the possibility of providing a public information document, rather than a legal document adopted by ordinance, containing specific information about a certain area.

Vice-Chairman Voytilla questioned the City of Tigard's position regarding Washington Square.

Ms. Fryer noted that the City of Tigard is currently considering adoption of their regulations for Washington Square in a manner similar to the City of Beaverton's adoption of the Murray Scholl's Town Center. She mentioned changes to map colors and wording within their existing document, which will not be a stand-alone document.

Mentioning citizen involvement and staff direction, Vice-Chairman Voytilla questioned the necessity of formulating a working relationship with the community in Tigard to formulate an "overall plan".

With respect to the overall planning process, Ms. Fryer informed him that Councilor Forrest Soth and Beaverton citizens had served on the advisory committee to the City of Tigard and staff had served on their technical advisory committee. She explained that the main concern had been to attain the numbers of jobs specified in the 2040 Compliance Report, as well as ensuring satisfaction of the community in terms of new regulatory framework. Representatives of the Nimbus Office Center and Cascade Plaza also served on the task force developing the recommendations. She noted that the City had not yet formed a committee to specifically review the Washington Square Regional Center as it applies to the City of Beaverton. She advised that the original recommendation in the compliance report had been for some type of a new office/commercial-type zone that would provide an increase in the density of development in the employment center.

NEW BUSINESS:

Commissioner Heckman discussed the situation with the current alternate Planning Commissioner, who has never attended a meeting, and suggested that the Commission invoke the by-laws, declare the position vacant and fill the position as soon as possible. He emphasized the importance of attending these meetings in the event the alternate should have to replace a current commissioner.

Commissioner Johansen expressed concern whether contact has been made with this individual to ensure he is aware of the situation.

Commissioner Heckman stated that the by-laws should be enforced or scrapped.

Vice-Chairman Voytilla expressed his agreement regarding by-laws, adding that the Commission had directed staff to contact this individual and it should be determined whether or not this has actually been done.

Observing that he does agree with Commissioner Heckman that the by-laws should be enforced, Commissioner Johansen noted that if the position were

vacated, this particular individual would be welcome to reapply if he truly desires to serve on the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Bode mentioned that Chairman Maks had indicated that he would make personal contact with this individual. She suggested that perhaps the alternate is not receiving the minutes and may not be aware he is missing meetings, expressing her opinion that maybe no feedback is feedback.

Vice-Chairman Voytilla pointed out that Chairman Maks had been detained with some personal issues and may have been unable to follow through with this contact.

Commissioner Wolch expressed his opinion that Chairman Maks should be allowed the opportunity to provide his input to this situation.

Referring to the current situation involving Chairman Maks, Vice-Chairman Voytilla suggested addressing the issue at the meeting of February 16, 2000.

Commissioner Heckman reminded other Commissioners that one of the requirements for this position is to be available at least 45 Wednesdays of every year for these meetings.

Commissioner Bode noted that this individual would be welcome to reapply if the position was vacated, adding that this issue involves respect for the by-laws and the necessity of a commission to function at its fullest potential.

Commissioner Heckman MOVED and Johansen SECONDED a motion to declare the position vacant and requesting that the Mayor provide a replacement alternate to the Planning Commission as soon as possible.

The question was called and the motion CARRIED. Commissioner Wolch voted "Nay".

MINUTES:

The minutes of November 10, 1999, as written, were submitted. Vice-Chairman Voytilla asked if there were any changes or corrections. Commissioner Heckman referred to the last paragraph of page 13, requesting the following amendment: "The change **is** in the required size of the replacement trees between the last hearing's version and this hearing's version." Commissioner Johansen MOVED and Commissioner Heckman SECONDED a motion that the minutes be amended and adopted, as amended.

The question was called and the motion CARRIED. Commissioner Bode abstained from voting on this issue.

The minutes of December 15, 1999, as written, were submitted. Vice-Chairman Voytilla asked if there were any changes or corrections. Commissioner Heckman referred to the second paragraph of page 7, requesting the following amendment: “creation of ~~non-double~~ **non-buildable** tracts,...”. Commissioner Heckman referred to the eighth paragraph of page 14, requesting the following amendment: “Commissioner Heckman ~~opened~~ **requested the** nominations for officers for the year 2000 **be opened.**” Commissioner Heckman referred to the ninth paragraph of page 14, requesting the following amendment: “**After minor discussions,** Commissioner Heckman MOVED and Commissioner Wolch SECONDED...” Vice-Chairman Voytilla referred to the fifth paragraph on page 10, requesting the following amendment: “He went back to that subdivision about four or five years after people ~~started taking~~ **occupied** homes.” Commissioner Heckman MOVED and Commissioner Jensen SECONDED motion that the minutes be amended and adopted as amended.

The question was called and the motion CARRIED. Commissioner Bode abstained from voting on this issue.

The minutes of January 5, 2000, as written, were submitted. Vice-Chairman Voytilla asked if there were any changes or corrections. Commissioner Heckman referred to the fifth paragraph of page 19, and following a discussion, requested the following amendment: “it was saying that the Commission condition them (the ~~appellant~~ **applicant**) to go back to ODOT...” Commissioner Heckman referred to the fifth paragraph of page 26, requesting the following amendment: “Commissioner Johansen stated that he was waiting to ~~here~~ **hear** some encouraging possibilities.” Vice-Chairman Pro Tem Voytilla referred to the eighth paragraph of page 20, requesting the following amendment: “Commissioner Voytilla ~~looked at~~ **referred to** the site plan, ~~relative to what some of those conditions were and functionally it was not going to work~~ **noting that relative to the ODOT recommendation, if the restrictions for access and the adjustments to the parking were implemented, the functional use of the parking lot would not be viable.**” Commissioner Johansen referred to paragraph 10 of page 16, requesting the following amendment: “these issues relate **specifically** to the issue of ~~livability~~ and appropriate development...” Commissioner Heckman MOVED and Commissioner Johansen SECONDED a motion that the minutes be amended and adopted as amended.

The question was called and the motion CARRIED unanimously.

The minutes of January 12, 2000, as written, were submitted. Vice-Chairman Voytilla asked if there were any changes or corrections. Chairman Heckman questioned when Commissioner Bode was first appointed, and Commissioner Bode responded that she had been appointed January 10, 2000, although she had not been informed until the morning of January 12, 2000. Commissioner Heckman questioned whether the minutes should reflect that Commissioner Bode had been absent from her first meeting. Commissioner Heckman referred to the

second paragraph of page 31, requesting the following amendment: “~~Mr. Commissioner~~ Voytilla stated the intent...” Commissioner Bode inquired whether it is usual to accumulate the minutes from four or five meetings prior to approving them, and she was informed that the minutes are approved as they are received and reviewed, although generally they do not accumulate to this extent. Vice-Chairman Voytilla referred to the sixth paragraph of page 10, requesting the following amendment: “In the notes of the minutes from the library parking lot hearing, the his comments had addressed his concern ~~that was going to be discouraged~~ regarding the parking lot.” Vice-Chairman Voytilla referred to the fourth paragraph of page 28, requesting the following amendment: “Commissioner Voytilla said that they had looked at ~~this application~~ the design of this project in pieces...” Commissioner Heckman MOVED and Commissioner Johansen SECONDED a motion that the minutes be amended and adopted as amended.

The question was called and the motion CARRIED. Commissioners Bode and Wolch abstained from voting on this issue.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:

Ms. Fryer outlined the schedule of future public hearings, specifically:

February 16, 2000	CPA 98-00011/TA 99-00010 -- Annexation Text Amendment, which will most likely be continued.
	CUP 99-00025 -- Jack in the Box on Regatta, which was continued from January 5, 2000.
	CPA 99-00029/RZ 99-00019 -- Annexation off of Cornell Road.
February 23, 2000	APP 2000-00001 -- Appeal of Sign Code interpretation.
March 1, 2000	Nothing scheduled.
March 8, 2000	Nothing scheduled.
March 15, 2000	CPA 99-00025 -- Land Use Element, at which comments will be received and it will be continued once again.
	TA 99-00011 -- Omnibus Text Amendment No. 3, which was continued from January 12, 2000.

March 22, 2000 CPA 99-00005/CPA 99-00006 -- Local Wetland Inventory.

Ms. Fryer noted that Senior Planner Steve Sparks had noted that there may be a Ballot Measure 56 scheduled for March 22, 2000 or March 29, 2000 or both nights, adding that this may involve another city-wide mailing.

Commissioner Wolch noted that week of March 22nd is Spring Break advised Vice-Chairman Voytilla that he will not be in attendance, so proper measures need to be taken to ensure that there is a quorum for the meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 8:37 p.m.